



The International Ruling Elite

By Ralph Fucetola

"Back In The US, Back In The US, Back In The USSR"- Beatles

The State is a method by which some rob many: it is the institutionalization of predation. We are beginning to understand how the State operates in America: the Rockefellers, Fords, Harrimans, Kennedys and the rest make "their" billions NOT by free trade and enterprise, but through government contracts, monopolies, subsidies, tariffs-the whole range of "controls" over our economy. How does this ruling elite analysis relate to international affairs? Certainly, our rulers use the State to protect "their overseas investments"; use the supposed threat of Soviet Russia to maintain and increase the nationalization of our economy in their hands.

But, something new is growing in this world. The United Nations and its subsidiary organs and regional bodies are taking on ever larger aspects of statepower. Therefore, it seems reasonable to analyze the the growing World State in its economic effect: who profits? I contend, that (along with its junior partners in Europe, Japan and Russia) the US ruling elite benefits. Perhaps an example, now will manifest how it tries to benefit.

Ever since the barbaric conquest of the Congo by Belgium - one of the bloodiest, beastly examples of bringing White "Civilization" to the peoples of the world - certain European based concerns have exploited the area's mineral wealth. Chief among these, was Union Miniere, backed by the Belgium Royal Family and Rothschild money, which had a state monopoly over the copper mines and other minerals of Katanga. As the Congo was about to become "independent", a new international combine was formed: Lamco, Swedish based, Rockefeller money behind it. A deal was made with the Congo's future rulers to "nationalize" Union Miniere and transfer the mineral monopoly to Lamco. The Belgium corporation sought to prevent this by supporting the secession of Katanga (which, by every rational criterion of nationhood, should have been a separate state: linguistically, culturally, and economically different from the more primitive Congo proper.) The struggle of the Katangese rulers for national autonomy was brutally crushed by United Nations forces, which, strangely, violated every principal of self-determination as well as its own Charter to force Katanga to join the Congo. STRANGE? No, not really: the head of Lamco was Dag Hammarsjoeld's brother! The Secretary General's brother Bo was also a leading figure in Anaconda, additionally, the connection with US ruling circles was solidified by the involvement of people like George Ball and the omnipresent New York financial concerns. The story has a "happy" ending: after several years of unimaginable bloodshed, Tsombe, vanquished leader of the Katanga secession, gained control of the entire Congo thus defeating the US backed group, and, though Tsombe is dead, the European exploiters maintain their control.

What is the point of this example? We cannot be sure what happened behind the scenes-in that jet set world shrouded in the secretiveness of plush sky-scraper offices, of bribes, threats and murders. We can only observe the results of international machinations, sometimes pinpointing individual ruling elite criminals. The example shows that we must apply our knowledge of statepower to the international sphere and fetal world government. At least, we are beginning to see that our enemy is not the ruling elite of a monopoly state isolated from its competitor states; rather, there is an international ruling elite, with its various interests vying for control of a worldwide cartel.

\*\*\*\*\*

The staff of the ABOLITIONIST would like to wish you and yours a Merry Christmas and Peaceful New Year & if you're a non-believer, a Happy Winter Festival.

\*\*\*\*\*

The Light Spot : "I regret that I even have one life to give to my country." -

Nathan Schneider

\*\*\*\*\*

Classified Ad : Subscribe to the ABOLITIONIST'S sister publication, LIFE AND LIBERTY published bi-monthly by the New Jersey Libertarian Alliance. Subscriptions are \$2/year and 25¢ for a sample copy. Make checks payable to Colin Claxon, 59 Duer St., North Plainfield, N.J. 07060.

Rates in this journal are five cents a word.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PEACE NOW**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG  
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

## OUR REVOLUTION: WHY LIBERATE THE LIBERATED?

BY W.B. CONGER

The repression that's sweeping this homeland of ours, friend, just might be the fault of poorly executed revolution. That angry retaliation against us in the form of hardhats, Middle Americans, and card-carrying members of the Silent Majority (i.e., the common man) is growing all over us like a damn fungus for one reason: the revolution has been no more than self-serving. We're fighting for our own liberation, which is of natural importance, but our minds are already liberated and before the real battle against the State begins, we should be waking up the Silent Majority (the taxpayer, serf, and slave) to our libertarian beliefs and proposed free culture. Only by filling our ranks and recruiting the majority to our side can the revolution for liberty be successful without the threat of repressive reaction.

Education toward laissez-faire and basic-anarcho-capitalistic principles has unfortunately been confined to our own body, when it should be aimed primarily at the presently uninformed and unaware government-crushed citizen. His lack of knowledge is not always a result of lack of concern. Dismay over excessive taxation has been displayed in local & state elections year after year; disgust at government intervention into businesses and bedrooms is shown by the common man through close examination. The real problem is simple: the common man is ignorant of any way to free himself or of any movement offering solutions to his questions. The libertarian educational system is lacking and insufficient. It is no more than the distribution of literature among the already-aware and those already confirmed to the cause. Massive distribution of materials among those ignorant Middle Americans (and hardhats) is a necessity in building our revolution.

But as the New American Revolution progresses today, the membership of the Silent Majority stands watching a new culture with little understanding of what is taking place. The common man sees a new idealism: non-restriction and liberated living. The New Revolution advocates absence of authority, something which the old culture citizen cannot comprehend, simply because he has never had the opportunity to examine the idea. And through his lack of knowledge and understanding, he disregards it as communistic hogwash and fights it. We have gained an enemy we should be recruiting. We are busy fighting against those whom we should be fighting with--because we share a common foe; the coercive State.

It should be our intention to correct our error--NOW. The common man, in his ignorance, demands more police protection, more recruits for FBI and CIA, more government repression... all to protect himself from the revolutionaries he does not understand. This man of ignorance is the man who damns longhairs as communists, cheers Chicago's cossacks, rallies behind the Manhattan construction workers, and commends Canada's police state tactics of terror in battling terrorists. He is the man who will drag this nation into a deeper fascism, a greater day of repression due to his lack of knowledge. To turn the tables, correct this terrible mistake, and enlighten this man should be our major goal. He is confused and has two alternatives: (1) to join the revolution for his liberation, or (2) to follow Spiro Agnew, who has become the voice of the common man and the Silent Majority's messiah, down the blind path to slavery. We've ignored him for too long.

Spiro has a hand full of aces.

\*\*\*\*\*

## THE ENEMY WITHIN

BY FRANK RICHTER

When Richard Meallouse Nixon says we need conscription to fight slavery and Jackal Javits says that the draft is going to free us from the military, who can blame radical libertarians for sometimes using rhetoric that spreads more confusion than light. We have learned from masters.

Rhetoric aside, however, free souls of the left and right had better learn to relate to one another, and damn quick too. The Canadian Inquisition can--eventually will--happen here. If we don't **hang together**, you can bet that we'll all hang separately. So, as long as the State deigns to grant us our "right" of free speech we'd better use it to unite us rather than to spread senseless--and primarily linguistic--distinctions among our ranks.

Let's take that bugaboo "private property rights." That expression scares off more together people than the National Guard can shake a club at. And with good reason. George Wallace talked about "private property" while he fought to defend compulsory segregation. Ronnie Rearguard shoved a lot of people from their park--offing one in the process--to defend the "property rights" of the "State of California." So when a bunch of ex-Yaffers start talking about property, it's time to listen carefully. The life you save could be your own.

# RICHTER CONTINUED

Let's face it, rightists, the expression "private property rights" is a bad one. Since everyone is his own "private" person, private property is an artless redundancy. Since everything that is useful is in the hands of some man or group of men (yes, even Rutgers Newark in case you haven't noticed,) there is no reason to draw a line between "public" and "private" property. The political hacks and robber barons that run Rutgers Newark are not publics. They are people. And the public universities of each state are every bit as much "privately controlled" as my toothbrush is. The fact is that every human creation on the face of the globe--whether in the U.S., China, or South Africa is presently "privately" controlled (or is not being used by anyone). To distinguish between "private" and "public" property is to create distinctions without a difference. So let's stop it. There is nothing to be gained by obscurantism.

What "right-wing libertarians" should talk about, if they want to discuss anything meaningful, is the distinction between legitimate control of property and illegitimate control. The essential libertarian axiom in this regard is that no one has the right to get control of anything for the purpose of initiating violence (or threatening to do so). The libertarian believes, therefore, that any other means of acquiring property is permissible (i.e., should not be prevented by force.) The libertarian credo can be expressed in a phrase: Anything peaceful, goes!

So, you have a right to use anything you find (as long as you didn't find it in your neighbor's pocket.) You have a right to trade anything you've found or created (including your labor, land or cannabis) for anything you want, provided that you can find someone who wants to voluntarily trade with you. You have the right to protect your life, liberty, and legitimately acquired property against those who start trouble (be they urban renewal experts, tax-collectors, cops or narcs.) You have the right to wrest stolen property from the hands of thieves, both "private" and "public!" Stolen property doesn't belong to the thief, it's that simple. The issue isn't "private" vs. "public" nor is it "individual" vs. "collective." The issue is legitimate vs. stolen.

The great German sociologist Franz Oppenheimer succinctly distinguished between the two ways of acquiring control over things, the two ways of acquiring property. The first way--the way of peaceful production and voluntary exchange--he called the economic way (since the total nexus of such activities is called an "economy!") The second means--the use of systematic violence, brutality and coercion--he dubbed the "political means," since only politicians and other sociopathic maniacs use the method with much regularity. "The State," Oppenheimer acutely observed, "is the organization of the political means."<sup>1</sup>

Now, the people who spend their time robbing, murdering and enslaving others learned long ago that they couldn't perpetuate such a grand scale rip-off without disarming their victims, both literally and psychologically. So the fruits of organized plunder that the State rulers collect, they say, belongs to "all of us," to be used as "we" decide. This charade found primitive expression in the laughable grammatical flimflam of the "royal We!" The same notion is employed today in such phrases as "the public trust," "the commonweal," and of course, the concept of "public property."

The booty collected by Ivan the Terrible and Richard the Noxious remains in the hands of the thieves who keep the game going. This doesn't mean that your congressman necessarily purchases yachts with the fruit of your labor. Most congressmen aren't even that healthy. They get their jollies by playing "God" with your gelt. And their decalogue has 100,000 commandments--most of them further abridgements of your right of self-determination. Not that everyone is harmed by this state of affairs the politicians gain fame and power; those businessmen and labor leaders who play their cards right get State monopolies, tariffs, subsidies, and the right to license, inspect and ban any companies or labor movements that might prove deleterious to profits and union dues of the fat cats of the ruling elite. Con Ed, Bell Tell, G.M., G.E., Standard Oil, General Dynamics, Dow, etc. are all the result, not of "property rights;" but of government rip-off, and state regulation of "economy." (i.e., of the people) If the industrial dinosaurs of the State Apparatus were forced to earn their bread rather than being able to steal it, they'd soon be whittled down to size. Such is the nature of the free market.

So, fellow libertarians of the Left, when the "right-wing libertarians" talk of "property rights," do not take it to be a defense of the Agnews or Reagans, Rockefellers or Rothschilds, men who never respect anyone's property but their own. Don't make the mistake of thinking that the freedom right rejects the great idea that men should seek joy and satisfaction through social effort, interdependence and mutual aid. The enemy is not the "property freak";



# RICHTER CONCLUDED:

the enemy is not the communalist. The enemy, for both the free left and the free right, is the man who--in a time of peace and without provocation--first picks up the gun. The bastard who stops making requests and starts giving orders.

Our common foe, the tyrant.

Our enemy, the State.

## footnote

<sup>1</sup> Franz Oppenheimer, The State (New York: Vanguard Press, 1926), pp. 24-25.

\*\*\*\*\*

## REFLECTIONS IN A VIETNAMESE CESSPOOL

BY JOHN BROTSCHOL

Last month, I flirted with the idea of writing an article for this journal entitled, "The Peace Movement--RIP." I was motivated in this direction by the overall failure of the October 31 demonstrations organized by the National Peace Action Coalition in over 40 cities, demanding the immediate withdrawal of all U.S. troops from Indochina. The turnouts were generally very low and rip-offs became more of the rule than the exception, as Yippies heckled speakers and shouted for immediate violent revolution (where have all the beautiful people gone?) At a demonstration in Washington, D.C., a black minister called on the police to remove the Yippies and the crowd applauded. There was also a noticeable drop in the participation of the white middle class who made peace a viable political issue. This group's defection can largely be attributed to the escalating rhetoric and violence against property being maintained by the Weathermen and others. They see the bombings on campuses and government buildings to be one step away from their homes, on which they finally made their last mortgage payment after ten long years. For the most part, the demonstrations were composed by the radical socialist left who initiated the peace movement seven years ago. Although we're still in Indochina, these protests combined with peace politics have been responsible for ending the political career of Lyndon Johnson, the cessation of the regular bombing of North Vietnam and the gradual withdrawal, instead increase of U.S. troops. There still remained elements of the once great Vietnam Peace Coalition which marched on the Pentagon in '67, supported Eugene McCarthy from the snows of New Hampshire to the crushing clubs of the Chicago police, last year's October moratorium and November's massive demonstration at the Washington Monument (Dick Gregory was unforgettable as his terse comments on the president glided on a biting wind) and last May when over 100,000 people came to the capitol on six days notice and boiled in 95 degree heat to protest the U.S. incursion into Cambodia and the killing of four students at Kent State. The pacifist War Resisters League, veterans and students all remained but in much smaller numbers.

It appeared that Richard Nixon had defused the issue with his program of gradual withdrawal and Vietnamization (increased funds for the training and arming of Thieu's troops while we remove our combat troops, lessening our casualties.) He combined this with an attack on the peace movement as being responsible for the violence of a minute group. This brilliant political move separated the middle class from the young demonstrators and we saw the results on October 31. During the recent election campaign, the Indochina War was not even a major issue, as candidate after candidate pledged their support for Nixon's program while attention was focused on the side effects of the war, the sad state of the economy & violence. Although Nixon's strategy was not a smashing success at the polls in spite of the San Jose rock throwing episode, a few doves were shot down. This will allow the president to continue a reduced war and maintain spending on the military industrial complex. Albert Gore's defeat to hawk Representative Brock in Tennessee, Charles Goodell's ouster by James Buckley and Maryland's Senator Joseph Tydings defeat by J. Glenn Beall (Tydings strong support of gun control proved to be his undoing) seriously depleted the Senate's nest of doves.

Yes, Nixon had proven himself a master politician, his handling of the Vietnam issue has been flawless, until now. The November bombing raids of North Vietnam have opened the Pandora box again. Radio Hanoi said the raids came in two waves, striking Hanoi and the port of Haiphong, killing many civilians. They also said, U.S. planes bombed a prisoner of war camp inflicting casualties on American captives. This is very likely because of the poor weather conditions. Defense Secretary Melvin Laird said the attacks were in retaliation for the North Vietnamese firing at "unarmed" reconnaissance planes. A U.S. spy plane was shot down November 13 over the North, apparently killing both crewmen. This was the 11th aircraft reported lost over North Vietnam since the bombing halt of November 1968. Last May 2, the United States blitzed North Vietnam in response to the downing of another spy plane. Laird said American planes bombed "missile and antiaircraft sites and related facilities" below the 19th parallel, Hanoi and Haiphong are more than 100 miles north of this line. Washington

BROTSCHEOL CONTINUED :

has always been a little weak on the truth. I just wonder how Laird would like it if spy planes flew over Washington, I don't think he'd sit passively by. The United States is waging war against North Vietnam and the assumption that they should sit idly by while the U.S. sends reconnaissance planes taking pictures of their defenses is ridiculous. Apparently, the United States makes new rules for war to suit its purposes.

In the field, brainwashed American troops level villages, indiscriminately torture and kill civilians (what's a gook anyway but an inferior animal) and rape Vietnamese women. Mark Lane has written a book entitled, Conversations With Americans, in which American atrocities are admitted by former participants in this conflict. One of the armies' favorites is throwing Vietnamese prisoners out of flying helicopters to force other gooks to talk. Other U.S. practices include the sticking of bayonets in female vaginas, pulling fingernails out with radio pliers, and attaching radio electrodes to male genitals. The United States has failed to ratify an international agreement banning genocide, obviously with good reason.

These developments probably will not start the large scale peace demonstrations but they are sad reminders that the war is still on. Nixon has fumbled the ball, the doves McGovern, Hatfield and Fulbright are flying again. If we play our cards right, we can win back the middle class who don't want their sons returning from Vietnam in a box. It will be tough, we've made a number of mistakes and Nixon has seized them for a continued military presence in Indochina to heavens knows when. At most, the Nixon policy means continued American deaths (in reduced numbers) in an immoral war while the peasants continue to suffer and die for the political aspirations of Thieu and Ky. We must remain firm and demand the immediate withdrawal of all U.S. troops and supplies from Indochina. This will force the Saigon regime and the Lon Nol government of Cambodia to come to terms with the liberation fronts or fold and give a war weary people, peace. Our tools are lobbying, letters to newspapers and officials and organizing. Resistance is a personal decision that usually never affects policy unless organizing has proceeded it.

Let's not let the Vietnam Issue Die!

\* After writing this article, I learned of the attempt by an elite corps of air force and army volunteers to "liberate" American prisoners from a camp 20 miles from Hanoi. Luckily, the Americans were removed from the camp because they probably would have all been killed. We can only hope that the North Vietnamese value life more than we do and don't initiate reprisals against their captives.

\*\*\*\*\*

THE QUOTE OF THE MONTH : "Of all violence, police violence is the most dangerous. Who will protect the public when the police violate the law?" RAMSEY CLARK

\*\*\*\*\*

MILTON FRIEDMAN, STATE EFFICIENCY EXPERT BY LYSANDOR NEWTON DANNESKJOLD

We have seen that the word "socialism" is ambiguous in that it has two meanings: state socialism, which allows for the initiation of force, and voluntary socialism, which does not. So it is with "capitalism".<sup>1</sup> The non-coercive kind of capitalism, free-market anarchy, is a system wherein all property (again, originally earned through homesteading, trade or received as gifts) is owned by individuals. These individuals have no formal contracts regulating the sharing of their wealth; sharing occurs informally through voluntary contributions and gifts. The free-market part of free market anarchy means that production shall be organized according to the principle of economic freedom. Each of us, instead of trying to be self sufficient and producing all that we may need, specializes and becomes more proficient at one or a few tasks. Since people can not live by shoes, singing services or even bread alone, we then trade these goods and services for the goods and services produced by others at any mutually agreeable prices. The economic freedom of the free market is seen in the voluntary nature of this whole nexus of production and exchange. The anarchy part of free market anarchy emphasizes two points implicit in a fully free market. (1) All goods and services shall be de-nationalized: food, clothing, shelter, coal, iron, steel, sanitation, post office, transportation, yes; but also fire protection, the monetary system, "public" utilities like gas and electricity (see "Public services under laissez faire" by J. Wollstein - SIL, 400 Bonifant, SS, Md. 20902), police protection, the court system and the army itself. It is important to realize that the arguments showing governmental inefficiency in the post office or nationalized coal fields (no market test of survival of the best entrepreneurs, less incentive to do a good job as opposed to appearing to do a good job, the well known advantages of the dollar vote over the political vote, the fact that civil service corporations can

<sup>1</sup> See RED HERRINGS in #9.

always make up losses out of tax funds and cannot become bankrupt) apply equally well to governmental inefficiency in providing roads, courts police etc. If anything, they are even more important since the government always attempts to monopolize the common posts of communication, education, justice, military power, money. (For a brilliant exposition of free market courts, police and justice see "Power and Market by Dr. Murray N. Rothbard - LABS.) Some writers think that these latter services are prerequisites for the free market, arguing that without police protection, for instance, there would be such chaos that no market could function, and that hence an institution prior to the market-government must provide them. But without food production there would be such starvation that no market could function either. This does not prove that food production should be nationalized (perhaps in vast collective farms?) any more than the importance of protection proves that police services should remain nationalized. These writers have failed to distinguish between a marginal increment of a good or service (without which the market would survive) and the whole stock of an important good or service (without which no human life, let alone any social organization, could survive.) (2) All forms of archy (anarchy merely means anti-archy) or statism initiate aggression against non-aggressors if only to tax people unwilling to pay. (An interesting side-light on how well entrenched archy is: ordinarily, forcing unwilling people to part with their money is called robbery; in the case of the state, we construe it as voluntary "club dues" and call it "taxes".) Even the Randian form of limited archy which eschews taxes, forbids innocent entrepreneurs from competing with the "legitimate" government in those functions it claims a monopoly over. In the fully free market, no one can have the right to order another about unless the arrangement is part of a voluntary contract agreed to by both parties. Yet where is the contract under which the government presumes to order its citizens about? It is very doubtful indeed that 200 million Americans would unanimously sign the present constitution of the United States, which is supposedly the legal basis of "our" government. (See NO TREASON by Lysander Spooner available at LABS)

The coercive kind of capitalism, state capitalism, the system we now have in the U.S., allows for and actively supports coercion on a massive scale. There is, to be sure, the rhetoric of the sanctity of private property rights. This is merely a sham, since taxes and eminent domain laws (the state grants itself to commandeer your property at whatever price it decides is "fair") are in direct conflict with the sanctity of private property. Aside from economic infringements like minimum wage, anti-drug, anti-prostitution, occupational licensure legislation which merely deny our rights to trade at mutually agreeable terms, (this kind of list stretches on endlessly) there is the more serious violation of property rights of the draft and the imperialist venture in Vietnam. Surely the most important piece of property an individual owns is the right to non-interference with his own person. The draft is a violation of property rights because it enslaves the individual; unjust wars, because they kill innocent people. Rather than continue to belabour the obvious point that private property in the U.S. is only skin deep, I should like to discuss in some detail the views of an eminent political economist who has done perhaps more than any other to invest the U.S. in general and the right-wing in particular with a facade of free market rhetoric; a man who in some ways may be the most dangerous enemy of freedom in America, mainly because much of his advice is based on free market principles but is geared not to eliminating governmental coercion as a truly free market requires, but instead to paring off the fat from our mixed economy, to making it run as well as possible. I speak of Milton Friedman, leader of the "Chicago School" of economics (In Vol.1, #9 of THE ABOLITIONIST, Steve Halbrook in a positively incisive article entitled "The Tragedy of Austrian Economics" exposed the libertarian pretensions of such as Bohm-Bawerk and Von Mises. The Chicago School is perhaps even more in need of such treatment than the Austrian, since of the two supposed free market advocates, it is presently more powerful.)

Friedman has called for the abolition of many laws that are clearly inconsistent with the libertarian, free market position. For instance agricultural price supports, tariffs, import quotas, rent control, minimum wages, ICC, FCC and other industrial regulations, social security, occupational licensure, public housing, and the postal monopoly. How then are we to determine if he is a bona-fide free market advocate or a free market-"value free"-Albert Speer type, efficiency expert for the state? I hold that these are relatively superficial issues for the ruling class; that if the state follows the free market solution in these matters but maintains power over the command posts of the economy which determine ultimate power, it will be actually streamlined and hence strengthened; that the crucial litmus test for a putative free market libertarian are his views on these all important command posts; that Friedman's record in this crucial area is dismal indeed. Let us, then, consider Friedman's views on education, military power, money, property distribution, and on taxation.

The voucher system is a plan whereby money now taken from taxpayers and given directly to



schools would instead be given to the parents of school age children in the form of credits toward tuition at qualified schools. The key is qualified schools. Right now, the educational apparatus serves as a vast brain-washing institution. It inculcates its young charges with patriotism, the flag, the pledge of allegiance, with the view that basically America is and has always been a force for good. If anarchist, black panther, communist, and other schools that countered this facile americanism were to be judged as qualified by the present educational power structure, only then might the voucher system have any libertarian merit. But this is as likely to occur as is the proverbial snowball not to melt in hell; Agnew would brand them as radical-liberals, or some such, and far from attaining any voucher plan money, they would be lucky to stay out of jail. What would happen if Friedman's voucher plan were put into effect, would be that inefficient brain-washing facilities would be weeded out or forced to improve (become less boring, etc.) as the dollar votes implied by the voucher plan were withheld from such schools. But the system as a whole would be strengthened. (See the attack on vouchers by G. Pearson: CIE, 9115 E. 13, Wichita, Kansas 67206.)

The voluntary military will make the U.S. war machine more efficient. It will reduce the retraining costs now necessitated by the low re-enlistment rates of poorly motivated draftees. In terms of real costs, it must be cheaper than the draft army, in terms of alternatives in production foregone, for those who would enter a volunteer army would be the ones with the least to lose in the civilian economy. The volunteer military will stifle domestic opposition to foreign wars. It will substitute professional murderers who will take pride in their work for gold-bricking amateurs who have little desire to kill or be killed in foreign jungles. But precisely who wants these results? the free market libertarian or the efficiency expert for the state? Of course no libertarian can support the draft system of involuntary servitude, but neither can he incessantly advise our rulers of the best manpower procurement policies so that they may more efficiently wage imperialistic wars.

In his monetary work, Friedman has quite properly criticized the fed for causing booms and busts, for causing the great depression in 1929, for attempting to fine tune the economy. Nowhere, however, in any of his published writings on the subject, has he called for the abolition of the fed and the re-introduction of the only monetary system consistent with libertarianism, the gold standard (strictly speaking, any monetary commodity or system voluntarily chosen by the people will do; the gold standard is often used as an example since gold has almost always been chosen whenever choice was allowed.) Instead, he calls upon the fed to increase the money supply at the rate of 5% per year. This is directly analogous to advising a group of counterfeiters not to be too greedy and kill the golden goose, but to rather content themselves with a 5% increment in golden eggs per year.

On innumerable occasions, Friedman has come out for the sanctity of property rights. Of presently held property right titles which are in no small part based on theft and aggression, that is. Once again, his seemingly free market position is more accurately interpreted as support for the status quo system. Surely, one of the mainstays of the free market position, is the return of stolen property. Or at least, if the stolen property cannot be recaptured, then it should be denied to the thieves. Since in our day and age the biggest thief is the state, most attacks on state property are justified; Ragnar Danneskjold's (a hero in Ayn Rand's "Atlas Shrugged") exploits with government ships can only be justified on this ground.

Although Friedman is not widely known for the part he played in bringing about the infamous withholding tax system, no exposee would be complete without its mention. As with so many other encroachments of our freedom, the withholding tax system was originally proposed as a war-time measure (War is the health of the state). After the war the state found it in its interest to maintain it, for it was the ideal answer to the old isolationist, individualist right wing who had hoped that the income tax would prove burdensome to pay all at once on April 15th; and that there would be mass refusals to comply with the income tax, leading to a roll-back of state power in general. The "beauty" of withholding is that no lump sum payments need ever be made. The taxes were extracted relatively painlessly all during the year by being withheld, thus short circuiting much aroused indignation.

It is to Milton Friedman's everlasting shame that he ever had anything to do with such a scheme; it shows his anti free market bias that even today he refuses to discontinue his role of efficiency expert for the state.

\*\*\*\*\*

THE ABOLITIONIST, a RADICAL LIBERTARIAN ALLIANCE NEWSLETTER, is published monthly by John Brotschol, Ralph Fucetola, Bill Baumgarth, W.B. Conger, Steve Halbrook, Frank Richter and Geoffrey Hall; subscriptions are \$2/year, make checks payable to the Libertarian Anarchist Bookservice. Member of the Libertarian Press Association.

Carl Oglesby, former chairman of Students for a Democratic Society has said that "Women's liberation is now the cutting edge of the movement," if this is true, I think its time to blunt the edge. Before you start flipping rocks at me, let me say, I agree women occupy secondary roles in western society and that some change is necessary. In the business community, women working full time earn 42% less than their male counterparts. When applying for an executive position, the first question asked of the female applicant is, "Can you type?" Upon getting married, the woman is expected to give up her job when she has children and devote the remainder of her life to the exciting world of cleaning the house, cooking and watching the daytime serials. This is not only the case with high school dropouts but with college graduates too. This waste of female talent is tragic.

A number of women liberationists have stopped yelling, "Male chauvinist pig!" and are acting to improve their situation. Communities are organizing inexpensive voluntary day care centers (women who don't desire professional careers act as nannies) where children can be deposited for eight hours while the wife ventures into the business world. Where day care centers do not exist, both spouses are sharing the boring household chores and raising the children. I prefer this solution over day care centers because parents have a responsibility to their off-spring and dumping them in day care centers (if not financially necessary) is not fulfilling that obligation. It is good for the child that the father is present more often in developing the youth's character. However, the demand of "free" state run day care centers is repugnant. First of all, why should a single person have to contribute to the maintenance of someone else's child while the parents are out making more money. Besides this, can you imagine the field day the state would have running these centers? They would be a welcomed extension to their brainwashing factories called schools. With parental influence lessened the state would have an almost free hand in molding the minds of their innocent victims. Super State here we come!

The call for free abortions is disgusting. I do not view abortion as murder but the wholesale liquidation of potential human beings on a whim is yet another indictment against this savage society. The monetary costs of an abortion might act as a barrier against such a grave act.

In closing, the wage differential between men and women performing the same task is unfortunate but that should be corrected by organizing and bringing social pressure on the particular business. Going to the government to create another bureaucracy to regulate wage levels is another burden on the taxpayer. And if women are willing to work at lower wages-whose fault is that? Women's liberation with their demands is probably one of the most statist oriented movements yet developed and libertarians should think twice before bootlicking it.

*Peace on Earth.....*



\*\*\*\*\*

Like father, like son.

"I do like to see the arms and legs fly."

-Colonel George S. Patton III

Commander, Eleventh Armored Cavalry Regiment

\*\*\*\*\*

"The best way to make Communists is to put Americans into a place where there were no Communists before." Norodom Sihanouk

\*\*\*\*\*

The Abolitionist

% LABS GPO 2487

New York City, N.Y. 10001



*Good Will to Men*

LIBERATED BY UNZ.ORG  
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED